IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LARRY BOWOTO, et al.,

No. C 99-02506 SI

Plaintiffs,

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CHEVRON CORP., et al.,

Defendants.

Now before the Court is defendants' motion for reconsideration of a portion of this Court's February 6, 2006, order. In that order, the Court granted plaintiffs' motion to compel further 30(b)(6) testimony from Chevron on "Topic 7(b)," which covered "the process for doing the types of realigning of the Intercompany Account Balances reflected on C17094-95, a general explanation of what the matters reflected on those documents mean, and an example of how the process works during the time period 1996-1999." After plaintiffs filed their motion, they took the deposition of Michael Kuba. Chevron asserts that Kuba sufficiently answered plaintiffs' questions about Topic 7(b), and therefore moves for reconsideration of this Court's earlier order compelling further 30(b)(6) testimony on that topic.

Plaintiffs do not contest that Kuba adequately answered their questions; the only dispute is over whether Kuba's deposition may be deemed to have been a 30(b)(6) deposition on Chevron's behalf. Plaintiffs are amenable to having Kuba's deposition be deemed a 30(b)(6) deposition, provided defendants withdraw all objections based on lack of foundation.

The Court agrees with defendants that plaintiffs' request is too broad. Defendants may have legitimately objected to plaintiffs' questions that exceeded the scope of Topic 7(b). Accordingly, the

Case 3:99-cv-02506-SI Document 1205 Filed 08/22/06 Page 2 of 2

1	C
2	d
3	P
4	q
5	
6	
7	
8	D
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25

26

27

28

Court rules as follows. Defendants' motion for reconsideration is GRANTED (Docket No. 1013). The
deposition of Michael Kuba is deemed to have been provided by Chevron under Federal Rule of Civi
Procedure 30(b)(6), and any objections based upon lack of foundation are overruled to the extent the
questions fall within the scope of Topic 7(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 21, 2006	Suran Illaton
6	CLICANIII I CTONI

SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge